

Source Selection Statement for the
8(a) Multiple Award Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity
General Construction - Minor Projects

1. On November 22 and 23, 2010, I met with members of the Streamlined Procurement Team (SLPT) appointed to evaluate the proposals for the 8(a) Multiple Award Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity General Construction - Minor Projects, Solicitation NNJ10333854R. Several other officials of the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center also attended the meeting.

Background

2. The 8(a) Multiple Award Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) General Construction (GC) - Minor Projects Contract (hereinafter, 8(a) IDIQ contract) is a firm fixed price, indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity, multiple award acquisition. The performance period of the contract is five-years, or a total contract value of \$49M, whichever occurs first. The total amount of all task orders under all contracts awarded under the solicitation shall not exceed \$49M for the five year period of performance.

3. The scope of the contract effort includes construction, modification and repair. The minor construction projects will involve a broad range of general construction skills and complexities to include: architectural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, civil, structural, roofing, partial building renovations, building demolition, and environmental support at Johnson Space Center (JSC), Ellington Field, Sonny Carter Training Facility, and White Sands Test Facility.

4. On August 12, 2010, the contracting officer issued Request for Proposal (RFP) NNJ10333854R with a proposal receipt date of September 16, 2010. Two amendments were issued on August 27, 2010 and September 10, 2010, respectively.

5. Offerors were notified the Government intends to award a contract or contracts resulting from this solicitation to the offeror(s) whose proposal(s) represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors and subfactors in the solicitation. Offerors were also notified the Government intended to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions. Section M.5, Source Selection Decision, of the RFP, provides, "the award of multiple 8(a) IDIQ contracts will be based on a Performance Price Trade-off Process. For those offerors who are determined to be technically acceptable (i.e., pass the technical proposal factor), tradeoffs will be made between past performance and price. Past Performance is significantly more important than Price."

Evaluation Procedures

6. The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the RFP. The evaluation process was as follows: (1) an initial evaluation was performed to determine if proposals were unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. The companies were also checked against the "List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-Procurement Programs," and proposals were reviewed for compliance with the solicitation

instructions. (2) all proposals were then evaluated against the factors listed in the RFP. These factors included technical acceptability (pass/fail), past performance and price.

7. Technical acceptability was assessed assigning ratings of either Acceptable (A), Potentially Acceptable (PA), or Unacceptable (U). Pursuant to the RFP, for technical acceptability, offerors were required to demonstrate bonding capacity of \$1 million per project and \$5 million for the aggregate project amount. Offerors with insufficient bonding capacities were eliminated from further consideration.

8. Each technically acceptable proposal received a performance confidence assessment rating based on the SLPT's evaluation of available information regarding each offeror's relevant past performance on recent projects. The SLPT relied upon questionnaires submitted by each offeror's customers, information contained in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and telephone interviews of customers of some offerors. In accordance with the RFP, the following adjective level of confidence ratings was utilized to assign a past performance rating: [1] Very High, [2] High, [3] Moderate, [4] Low, [5] Very Low, and [6] Neutral.

9. The Government performed a price analysis to determine price reasonableness. The proposed model task order price was evaluated for price reasonableness by comparison against the Government estimate and prices submitted by other offerors.

Evaluation of Proposals

10. Twenty-two offers were received in response to the RFP. The firms that submitted proposals are (in alphabetical order): (1) Affiliated Western, Inc (Affiliated); (2) All American Brothers Company LLC (All American Brothers); (3) Angayuk Construction Enterprises, Inc (Angayuk); (4) C3, LLC (C3); (5) Competitive Choice/Gen-Tech JV (Competitive/Gen-Tech); (6) Federal Construction Group Inc. (Federal); (7) Hallmark Capital Group, LLC (Hallmark); (8) International Suppliers (International); (9) Jamco Group IV (Jamco Group); (10) Jarreau-Durotech; (11) Keiland Construction LLC (Keiland); (12) Mirador Enterprises, Inc (Mirador); (13) Persaud Companies, Inc (Persaud); (14) P2MG; (15) SIA Construction (SIA); (16) Streeter Construction Group, LLC (Streeter); (17) The Davitz Group (Davitz); (18) The Gee Cee Company of LA, Inc (Gee Cee); (19) Total Team Construction Services, Inc (Total Team); (20) Triune; (21) Tropical Contracting & D. Wilson (Tropical & Wilson); and (22) W.A. Robbins Construction Co., Inc (Robbins).

11. None of the offerors took exception to the RFP requirements. All proposals, except two, were determined technically acceptable. The SLPT determined the proposals submitted by International and SIA were technically unacceptable and could no longer be considered for award, and thus were removed from the source selection competition. Each firm was notified in writing pursuant to FAR 15.503, Notifications to Unsuccessful Offerors. The SLPT evaluated the past performance and price of the remaining 20 proposals.

12. There was adequate price competition to enable the SLPT to determine that all of the price proposals were reasonable.

13. The past performance confidence assessment was assessed at an overall factor level after evaluating aspects of each offeror's recent past performance that were relevant to the RFP effort.

Individual Past Performance Evaluations

14. Jarreau-Durotech's past performance confidence assessment rating is "High Level of Confidence." Jarreau-Durotech is a joint venture between Jarreau and Associates and Durotech. Jarreau-Durotech received exceptional and very good ratings on three recent and very relevant projects. On three somewhat relevant projects, the offeror received exceptional and very good ratings. The SLPT determined Jarreau-Durotech has a high level of safety performance.

15. Mirador's past performance confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." Mirador submitted a list of projects for themselves and for Comanche Contractors. The SLPT reviewed information only for Mirador because Comanche's relationship to Mirador was not specified in the proposal. Mirador received exceptional ratings on one very relevant project and on one somewhat relevant project. They received exceptional to very good ratings on one relevant project. The SLPT determined Mirador has a low level of safety performance.

16. Davitz' past performance confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." The SLPT evaluated the past performance information for Davitz and its teaming partner, Jarrett Construction Co (Jarrett). Davitz received exceptional and very good ratings on its one relevant project. The SLPT was unable to determine a level of safety performance for Davitz because of a lack of submitted OSHA data. For Jarrett, three projects were determined very relevant and two were determined relevant. On the very relevant projects, Jarrett received the following ratings: (1) exceptional, (2) very good and (3) above average. On the relevant projects Jarrett received exceptional and very good ratings on one and satisfactory ratings on the other. The SLPT determined Jarrett has a high level of safety performance. Although Jarrett has very relevant past performance, Davitz did not demonstrate how the overall oversight, management, and other resources of Jarrett would meaningfully affect the performance of the acquisition as required by the RFP. The SLPT, therefore, relied on Davitz' past performance information to make its confidence assessment. The fact that there was insufficient data to assess the Davitz safety performance also contributed to the moderate confidence rating.

17. C3's past performance confidence assessment rating is "High Level of Confidence." C3 received the following ratings on the six very relevant projects: (1) exceptional to satisfactory on three projects, (2) exceptional to very good, (3) exceptional, (4) a very good. The PPIRS disclosed a relevant project for which they received an overall rating of good. The SLPT determined C3 has a high level of safety performance.

18. Triune's past performance confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." Triune received exceptional to satisfactory ratings on one very relevant project. On a relevant project and a somewhat relevant project, Triune received exceptional ratings. The SLPT search of PPIRS disclosed two very relevant projects and one relevant project, each of which the offeror received an overall satisfactory rating and some negative comments. The SLPT determined Triune has a very high level of safety performance.

19. Hallmark's past performance confidence assessment rating is "High Level of Confidence." The SLPT evaluated the past performance information for both Hallmark and its teaming partner, 4 City Construction & Development; however, because Hallmark did not demonstrate how the overall oversight, management, and other resources of its teaming partner would meaningfully affect the performance of the acquisition as required by the RFP, the SLPT relied on Hallmark's past performance information. 4 City Construction received a high level of safety performance. Hallmark received exceptional ratings on two very relevant projects. The SLPT determined Hallmark has a high level of safety performance.

20. Affiliated's confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." On one relevant project, the offeror received "exceptional to satisfactory ratings and on one somewhat relevant project, they received exceptional ratings. A review of PPIRS revealed another relevant project for which they received an overall satisfactory rating. The SLPT determined Affiliated has a high level safety of performance.

21. Angayuk's confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." Angayuk received exceptional to satisfactory ratings on one very relevant project. On one relevant project, they received an exceptional rating and on another relevant project, they received exceptional to very good performance ratings. On one somewhat relevant project, they received an exceptional rating and on another somewhat relevant project, they received outstanding to satisfactory ratings. The SLPT determined there was not enough data to evaluate the offeror's safety performance.

22. Streeter's confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." The SLPT evaluated the past performance information for Streeter and its teaming partner, Summit Builders (Summit). Streeter received exceptional to very good ratings on one very relevant project. On two relevant projects, they received very good to satisfactory ratings. They received a very good rating on one somewhat relevant project. The SLPT determined Streeter's safety level of performance is moderate. For Summit, on four very relevant projects, which were similar in scope, magnitude and complexity as required in the RFP effort and involved a broad range of general construction skills, they received exceptional to very good ratings. Although Summit had four very relevant projects for which they received exceptional to very good ratings, the SLPT relied on Streeter's past performance history because Streeter did not demonstrate how the overall oversight, management, and other resources of Summit would meaningfully affect the performance of the acquisition as required by the RFP.

23. Gee Cee's confidence assessment rating is "High Level of Confidence." On two very relevant projects, Gee Cee received "exceptional to very good ratings. On one relevant project, they received an overall excellent rating, and on another relevant project, they received exceptional to very good ratings. On two somewhat relevant projects, they received either excellent to good or exceptional to very good ratings. The SLPT determined Gee Cee has a high level of safety performance.

24. Tropical and Wilson's confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." Tropical and Wilson is a joint venture between Tropical Contracting and D. Wilson. On one very relevant project, the offeror received very good to satisfactory ratings, and on another very

relevant project, the offeror received exceptional to satisfactory ratings. On one somewhat relevant project, the offeror received an overall exceptional rating. A review of the PPIRS showed one relevant project in which the offeror received an outstanding to satisfactory rating. The SLPT determined Tropical and Wilson's safety level of performance is moderate to low.

25. Competitive/Gen-Tech's confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." Competitive/Gen-Tech is a joint venture between Competitive Choice, Inc., and Gen-Tech, LLC. Gen-Tech had three very relevant projects: On one they received exceptional to very good ratings, on the second one, they received an exceptional rating, and on the third one, they received exceptional to satisfactory rating. Gen-Tech received exceptional to very good ratings on one somewhat relevant project. Competitive received exceptional to very good ratings on two somewhat relevant projects. Competitive received an exceptional rating on another somewhat relevant project. The SLPT determined Competitive/Gen-Tech has a high level of safety performance.

26. Federal's confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." Federal received exceptional to very good ratings on two relevant projects and on two somewhat relevant projects. On another somewhat relevant project, they received exceptional ratings. The SLPT determined Federal has a high level of safety performance.

27. Robbins' confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." On one very relevant project, the offeror received exceptional to very good ratings. On two somewhat relevant projects, the offeror received exceptional ratings. On two other somewhat relevant projects, they received exceptional to very good ratings and on another somewhat relevant project, they received exceptional to satisfactory ratings. The SLPT determined Robbins has a very high safety level of performance.

28. Total Team's confidence assessment rating is "High Level of Confidence." On three very relevant projects, the offeror received the following ratings: (1) very good, (2) exceptional to very good rating, and (3) exceptional to satisfactory ratings. On one relevant project, the offeror received very good and satisfactory ratings and on another relevant project, the offeror received exceptional to satisfactory ratings. On three somewhat relevant projects, the offeror received the following ratings: (1) exceptional to very good, (2) very good to marginal, and (3) exceptional. The SLPT determined the offeror has a high level of safety performance.

29. Keiland's confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." The offeror submitted projects for its teaming partners, Bay Electric and Teya Technologies. On one relevant project and on one somewhat relevant project, Keiland received exceptional ratings. Bay Electric received exceptional to satisfactory ratings on one very relevant project. The SLPT determined Keiland's safety level of performance is moderate. Keiland's teaming partner, Bay Electric, received exceptional to satisfactory ratings on one very relevant project. No safety information was provided on Bay Electric and Teya Technologies. The SLPT relied on Keiland's past performance because Keiland did not demonstrate how the overall oversight, management, and other resources of its teaming partners would meaningfully affect the performance of the acquisition as required by the RFP.

30. Persaud's confidence assessment rating is "High Level of Confidence." On three very relevant projects, the offeror received exceptional to very good ratings. On a fourth very relevant project, they received exceptional and some marginal ratings. The offeror received exceptional and very good ratings on a relevant project. The SLPT determined the offeror has a high to moderate level of safety performance.

31. P2MG's confidence assessment rating is "Low Level of Confidence" demonstrating it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards. The SLPT reviewed two somewhat relevant projects in which on one, the offeror received very good to satisfactory ratings and on another, they received exceptional to very good ratings. The SPLT determined P2MG has a high level of safety performance.

32. All American Brothers' confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." On one relevant project, the offeror received excellent to very good ratings and on two other relevant projects, the offeror received above average to satisfactory ratings. On one somewhat relevant project, the offeror received exceptional to satisfactory ratings and on two other somewhat relevant projects, the offeror received exceptional to very good ratings. The SLPT determined the offeror has a high level of safety performance.

33. Jamco Group's confidence assessment rating is "Moderate Level of Confidence." Jamco Group is a joint venture between Jamco Ventures, LLC and Mapco, Inc. On one very relevant project, the offeror received outstanding to satisfactory ratings, and on another very relevant project, the offeror received exceptional and very good ratings. On five relevant projects, the offeror received the following ratings: (1) very good to satisfactory (2) above average to satisfactory (3) exceptional to satisfactory, (4) outstanding to satisfactory and (5) satisfactory to marginal. The SLPT determined Jamco Group has a low level of safety performance.

Price

34. In addition to past performance, the 20 technically acceptable proposals were evaluated on price. The proposed model task order prices were evaluated for price reasonableness by comparison against the Government estimate and prices submitted by the other offerors. The SLPT determined that all twenty proposed prices were reasonable in accordance with FAR 15.403-1(C)(1).

35. The past performance and price evaluation results are provided as follows:

Company	Past Performance Level of Confidence	Price
HALLMARK	High	\$281,109.45
C3	High	\$288,908.00
JARREAU-DUROTECH	High	\$309,388.00
TOTAL TEAM	High	\$297,463.92
GEE CEE.	High	\$336,452.00
PERSAUD.	High	\$461,665.46

AFFILIATED	Moderate	\$195,502.18
KEILAND	Moderate	\$248,915.00
JAMCO GROUP	Moderate	\$249,609.31
TROPICAL & WILSON	Moderate	\$262,162.29
STREETER	Moderate	\$269,548.00
MIRADOR	Moderate	\$274,331.00
COMPETITIVE/ GEN-TECH	Moderate	\$280,155.00
DAVITZ	Moderate	\$282,453.00
ROBBINS	Moderate	\$282,638.00
ANGAYUK	Moderate	\$284,193.79
TRIUNE	Moderate	\$319,506.00
FEDERAL	Moderate	\$435,083.05
ALL AMERICAN BROTHERS	Moderate	\$448,184.63
P2MG	Low	\$430,413.79

Source Selection Decision

36. With respect to the 8(a) IDIQ contract, my decision was based on selecting the proposals offering the best value and consistency with the RFP's stated criteria for award. I reviewed the SLPT evaluation and posed a variety of questions. After considering the SLPT's answers to my questions, I took exception to the SLPT's evaluation of Keiland's proposal and Competitive/Gen-Tech's proposal. I adopted the SLPT's evaluation for the remaining offerors.

37. I assess Competitive/Gen-Tech's past performance confidence level as "High." The SLPT placed greater weight on the offeror's four somewhat relevant projects and the minor discrepancy in its safety data. In my analysis, I placed greater weight on the offeror's three recent and very relevant projects for which they received mostly exceptional and very good ratings. Additionally, I view the discrepancy between the offeror's safety data as minor. The offeror's safety data demonstrates a high level of safety performance.

38 I agree with the "High" past performance confidence level rating the SLPT gave Hallmark, C3, Jarreau-Durotech, Total Team, Gee Cee, and Persaud. I determined there were no significant discriminators among these six proposals and Competitive/Gen-Tech's proposal. Of the past performance data reviewed, these offerors consistently received exceptional or excellent and very good ratings for recent and very relevant and relevant projects that were either similar or greater in scope, complexity and magnitude as the required RFP effort. These offerors demonstrated experience performing work involving a broad range of general construction skills, concurrent projects, and in occupied areas. These offerors' customers provided many positive comments including, but not limited to: "exceptional performance...adhered to schedule and completion dates...completed project ahead of schedule...timely completed punchlist." Adherence to schedule, timely or early completion of a project and timely completion of punchlist items provide reasonable assurance of lower contract and administration oversight cost and would result in an opportunity for the Government to shift resources to other mission essential projects. Additionally, these offerors either have a high or moderate to high safety level

of performance demonstrating adequate loss prevention and a commitment to safety. JSC places a high value on a safety culture because of the nature of its mission. For that reason, a high level of safety performance brings value to JSC.

Trade-off Analysis

39. This analysis takes into consideration the detailed evaluations of each offeror's proposal as documented above and is the justification for my final decision in selecting offerors for award. Since the lowest price offerors, did not receive "Very High" level of confidence ratings for past performance, and higher priced offerors received higher past performance confidence ratings, I performed a tradeoff between the highest rated proposals and other offers. I determined the highest rated proposals are those submitted by Competitive/Gen-Tech, Hallmark, C3, Jarreau-Durotech, Total Team, Gee Cee, and Persaud (hereinafter, higher-rated, high-priced offerors). Each of these offerors received a "High" level of confidence adjectival rating demonstrating very effective past performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements. Their prices, although higher than the Government estimate, are competitive. I analyzed all other offers against these seven higher-rated, higher-priced offers.

40. I agree with the "Moderate" confidence rating the SLPT gave Affiliated. I recognize Affiliated has a high level of safety performance. I note Affiliated received primarily satisfactory ratings on both of its relevant projects and its projects were only slightly similar in scope and complexity to the required RFP effort. I further note Affiliated's projects did not, in and of themselves, involve a broad range of general construction skills.

41. I recognize the SLPT rated Keiland's past performance confidence level as "Moderate," but after reviewing the offeror's past performance information, I assessed it as "Low." My assessment is based on Keiland's one and only relevant project, which was only slightly similar in complexity and not similar in magnitude of the proposed solicitation effort. Keiland's proposed the second lowest price; however, it's "Low" confidence adjectival rating demonstrates it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards. Because of Keiland's "Low" confidence rating, I have a low level of confidence that it can successfully perform the required effort.

42. I agree with the "Moderate" confidence level rating the SLPT gave Jamco Group. I recognize Jamco Group's outstanding, very good and satisfactory ratings on its very relevant projects and the many positive comments. I note, however, that Jamco Groups' projects were similar in magnitude, but only slightly similar in scope and not similar in complexity to the required RFP effort. I note most of Jamco Groups' projects involved simple work and individually did not involve a broad range of general construction skills. I am also concerned with Jamco Group's low level of safety performance. Unsafe performance could cause project delays, which would, in turn, impact cost and affect the personal safety of personnel at JSC. JSC places a high value on a safety culture because of the nature of its mission. For that reason, a high level of safety performance brings value to JSC.

43. I agree with the "Moderate" confidence rating the SLPT gave Tropical and Wilson. I recognize on very relevant and relevant projects, Tropical and received ratings ranging from

exceptional to satisfactory. I also recognize the offeror's customers provided many positive comments. I am concerned, however, with Tropical and Wilson's low to moderate safety level of performance as a result of the numerous reported OSHA recordable injuries or illness. Unsafe performance could cause project delays, which would, in turn, impact cost and affect the personal safety of personnel at JSC. JSC places a high value on a safety culture because of the nature of its mission. For that reason, a high level of safety performance brings value to JSC.

44. I agree with the "Moderate" confidence rating the SLPT gave Streeter. I recognize Streeter received exceptional to very good ratings on the one very relevant project. I note the majority of Streeter's projects were relevant for which they received primarily satisfactory ratings and contained a limited range of general skills. I recognize the positive customers' comments. Streeter provided a limited amount of OSHA safety data, thereby, precluding the SLPT and me from obtaining a safety trend for the company. JSC places a high value on a safety culture because of the nature of its mission. For that reason, a high level of safety performance brings value to the JSC.

45. I agree with the "Moderate" confidence rating the SLPT gave Mirador. Although I recognize Mirador received mostly exceptional ratings on one very relevant project and exceptional to very good ratings on a relevant project, I note it has limited experience performing on projects that involve a broad range of general construction skills. I also note and I am concerned with Mirador's low safety level of performance. Unsafe performance could cause project delays, which would, in turn, impact cost and affect the personal safety of personnel at JSC. JSC places a high value on a safety culture because of the nature of its mission. For that reason, a high level of safety performance brings value to JSC.

46. I agree with the "Moderate" past performance confidence level rating the SLPT gave Davitz. I note Davitz has limited construction experience or performance on projects of the scope, complexity and magnitude of the required RFP effort. I recognized Davitz received exceptional to very good ratings on its sole and only relevant project. I note this project did not involve a broad range of general construction skills. Davitz' lack of required safety data precluded the SLPT and me from adequately evaluating its safety level of performance. JSC places a high value on a safety culture because of the nature of its mission. For that reason, a high level of safety performance brings value to JSC.

47. I agree with the "Moderate" past performance confidence level rating the SLPT gave Robbins. I recognize Robbins has a high level of safety performance and positive customers' comments. I note, however, Robbins has limited relevant past performance on projects of the complexity, scope, and magnitude as the required RFP effort. I also note Robbins' projects did not individually encompass a broad range of general construction skills.

48. I agree with the "Moderate" past performance confidence level rating the SLPT gave Angayuk. I note Angayuk received excellent to satisfactory ratings on its one and only very relevant project and its projects involved a limited range of general construction skills and were limited in performing work in an occupied area. In addition, I noted that based on the information received, the SLPT could not determine Anguyak's level of safety performance.

49. I agree with the "Moderate" past performance confidence level rating the SLPT gave Triune. I note most of Triune's projects were similar in scope, complexity and magnitude as the required RFP. I also note, however, Triune received primarily satisfactory ratings on two very relevant projects and a relevant project and some negative customers' comments. I recognize Triune has a high safety level of performance.

50. I agree with the "Moderate" past performance confidence level rating the SLPT gave Federal. I note Federal received primarily exceptional and very good ratings on two relevant projects. I further note, however, the majority of Federal's projects were only slightly similar in scope to the required RFP effort and involved a minimal amount of disciplines. I note these projects lacked complexity and involved simple work to be performed within minimal disciplines. I recognize Federal has a high safety level of performance. I believe the price differences between Persaud and Federal is miniscule for the significant difference in past performance.

51. I agree with the "Moderate" past performance confidence level rating the SLPT gave All American Brothers. I note All American Brothers received primarily satisfactory and some very good ratings on only one relevant project. I also note three of the six projects reviewed were only somewhat relevant. I further note, the majority of All American Brothers' projects were only slightly similar in scope to the required RFP effort and involved a minimal amount of disciplines. These projects also lacked complexity and called for simple work to be performed within minimal disciplines. I recognize the positive comments provided by the offeror's customers. I also recognize All American Brothers has a high safety level of performance. I believe the price differences between Persaud and All American Brothers is miniscule for the significant difference in past performance.


52. I agree with the "Low" past performance confidence level rating the SLPT gave P2MG. My decision is based on the offeror having received primarily very good ratings and some exceptional and satisfactory ratings on two somewhat relevant projects, which were not similar in magnitude and complexity as the required RFP effort. I recognize P2MG customers provided positive comments. I also recognize P2MG has a high safety level of performance. P2MG's "Low" confidence adjectival rating demonstrates it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards. I have a low level of confidence that it can successfully perform the required effort. I believe the price differences between Persaud and P2MG is miniscule for the significant difference in past performance.

Final Decision

53. With past performance being significantly more important than price and for the reasons stated above, I do not consider award to the lower-rated, lower-price offerors to be in the best interest of the Government for the cost differences between their prices and the higher-rated, higher-priced offerors and the resultant differences in their past performance ratings. I believe the lower-rated, lower-price offerors would require much greater oversight, which would, in turn, result in a significant increase in cost to the Government. Thus, the Government would stand to lose much more than the cost difference as proposed if successful performance is lacking on

proposed projects. I believe the higher-rated, higher-priced offerors' excellent or exceptional or very good past performance on very relevant and relevant projects and high or high to moderate safety level of performance will result in significant cost savings to the Government and is worth the cost premium associated with their proposals.

54. In summary, based on my assessment of all proposals in accordance with the specified evaluation criteria, it is my decision that the proposals submitted by Competitive/Gen-Tech, Hallmark, C3, Jarreau-Durotech, Total Team, Gee Cee, and Persaud represent the best value to the Government to fulfill the needs of these multiple award contracts for the RFP effort.


Debra L. Johnson
Source Selection Authority

1/21/11
Date